

Remarks

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-4, 8-10, 12, and 18-24 are pending in the application, with claims 1 and 22 being the independent claims. Claims 1-2, 4, 9-10, 12, 22, and 24 are sought to be amended to correct formalities, and/or clarify the invention. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and do not require a new search, and therefore their entry is respectfully requested. Based on the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-2, 4, 9-10, 12, and 22-23 stand objected to for various informalities. These claims have been amended per the Examiner's suggestions, with the exception of claims 22 -23. Claim 22 was amended to remove the *differential* feature from the claim, and therefore the objection to claims 22-23 is moot. Claim 1 was also amended to further refine the invention, so as to move the differential transmission line to the preamble. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the objections be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 22-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,212,229 to Salinger (hereinafter "Salinger") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,608,707 to Smith (hereinafter "Smith"). Applicant traverses this rejection based on the discussion below.

Claim 22 has been amended to include the features that were indicated to be allowable for claim 1, as indicated in the "Reasons for Allowance" of the Office Action. These amendments are not of a nature that should require a new search, since similar features were claimed in allowable claim 1. Extraneous features have been removed from the claim 22. Accordingly, claim 22 should now be allowable over Salinger in view of Smith, as the combination does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention, for the same reasons as claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of claim 22 be reconsidered and withdrawn and that this claim be passed to allowance. Claims 23 and 24 are patentable over the cited art for being dependent on an allowable base claim, in addition to their own patentable features.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Jeffrey T. Helvey
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,757

Date: 4/2/09

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

960227_1.DOC